

CLARK COUNTY CLEAN WATER COMMISSION

Wednesday, October 4, 2000
6:00 – 8:30 PM

Clark County Public Works Department
Conference Room
4700 NE 78th Street
Vancouver, Washington

Call to Order

Roll Call:

Commission Members Present

Robert Agard, Willie Bourlet, Cal Ek, Dana Kemper, Mary Martin
Susan Rasmussen, Don Steinke, and Peter Tuck

Commission Members Absent

Art Stubbs

County Public Works Staff

Kelli Frost, Cindy Meats, and Earl Rowell

Public

Randy Demlow, Jay Harrison, and William Kravas

Introduction:

The members of the Clean Water Commission, Clark County staff and the public were introduced. Chair Commissioner, Mr. Agard, then called the meeting to order.

Agenda and Material Review:

Mr. Rowell reviewed the material for the meeting.

1. The Agenda.
2. Work Session Notes for September 20 meeting.
3. Calendar of Clark County Clean Water Commission and other Water-related events.
4. E-mail from Earl Rowell regarding Mr. Jenkins comments from The Reflector.
5. Outline of the Clean Water Program 2000 Service Fee process.
6. Fax from Kirby Doyle, Automax, Inc. to Jim Mansfield.
7. Clark County Endangered Species Act Information, Newsletter.
8. E-mails from Luanne Coachman to Earl Rowell.
9. E-mail and attachment from Rod Swanson regarding forest cover, impervious-surface area, and the mitigation of urbanization impacts in King County, Washington.
10. Article from Stormwater magazine, November/December 2000 issue; regarding The Stormwater Utility: Will it work in your Community.

11. Greenlines: A newsletter for Clark County Environmental Educators.
12. An article from The Columbian, dated October 4, 2000. Titled - Lawsuit Disputes County's runoff fee.
13. An article from The Reflector, titled; Gestapo enforcement of storm rules is feared.
14. A review of the following standards to evaluate elements of the clean water program. The what, who, when, where, why and how.

Meeting Notes

September 20, 2000:

The notes to the September 20, 2000 meeting were approved as corrected.

Discussion about the Goals/Standards/Process to be used by Committees

Mr. Rowell provided the Commissioners with a hand out which will serve as a guide and a worksheet as they evaluate elements of the Clean Water Program. It can also serve as a reference when developing the annual report to the Board of Commissioner.

Some points to consider are as follows.

Evaluation Criteria:

- ◆ **Acceptable:** is it fair and equitable?
- ◆ **Effective and Complete:** it meets NPDES permit requirements (protects water resources from stormwater pollution)
- ◆ **Efficient:** it is easy to understand and administer.
- ◆ **Accountable:** one can track the funds, costs and effectiveness of the action.

Public Input

Mr. Kravas expressed his concern of having no income to pay the Clean Water Fee.

Group Discussion

Science/Education:

The Commissioners discussed what currently was being implemented and ideas which could be offered in schools in regards to teaching clean water programs to students.

River Rangers: A classroom presentation, which is currently offered to 3rd and 4th grade classrooms as requested. The goal is to reach 100% participation.

Residential BMP manual: The commissioners discussed the possibility of having this manual be available to teach to the junior high students.

Water Monitoring: Cindy Meats recommended that a water-monitoring program be directed towards High School students.

Mr. Steinke suggested that Cindy Meats inquire about giving a short presentation, which would describe the programs we hope to teach the students, at Science Department meetings in the Junior High and High Schools.

Mr. Ek commented that they should look at the educational goals of the NPDES permit and make sure the programs they are suggesting would fall under those criteria.

Incentives:

A variety of options on how to implement incentives were discussed.

- ♦ Any surplus in the Clean Water Fee should be given back to the people.
- ♦ Make those who are in non-compliance with BMP's pay more than those who are in compliance.
- ♦ The fee should be based on water contamination not volume of water.
- ♦ Have all people pay the same, regardless of parcel size.

The commissioners discussed researching grants as a source of revenue for implementing an incentive plan. They also talked about the possibility of hiring someone who would research grants.

Commissioner Martin remarked that they should not forget their goal of cleaning up the water.

Budget:

Mr. Rowell clarified some questions regarding the budget that was brought up at the last Clean Water Meeting on September 20, 2000 from Thom McConathy.

At the previous meetings there was a question about \$36,399 being charged without funding. That cost should be charged to the Enforcement section of the budget (charged to object code 911) since it relates to inspection work by Community Development.

Mr. Rowell could find no reference to Mr. McConathy's inquiry as to \$5,000 being spent on weed control. Mr. Rowell will have Mr. Swanson follow up with Mr. McConathy.

Newspaper article:

The commissioners discussed the article from The Columbian, dated October 4, 2000 in regards to a lawsuit filed in Superior Court, by State Representative Tom Mielke, and Edwin D. Uselmann. The lawsuit claims that the county's basic \$33.00 annual storm water fee unlawfully discriminates against many of the 55,000 owners of property in unincorporated areas. There was concern over how this may effect the clean water fee in the future.

Future guests:

Commissioner Agard mentioned that he would invite Pete Capell, Acting Public Works Director to a future Clean Water Commission meeting.

Next Steps

Next Meeting:

The Clean Water Commission's next meeting is on Wednesday, October 18, 2000.

Adjourn

Commissioner Agard adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

